NOTE

ONLY THE FOLLOWING PAGES OF THIS PUBLICATION

HAVE BEEN FILMED

p. 1, 8.

_____

_____

_____

8320 EIT10 WSAAO MARBO
ACQUISITIONS EDITOR NF
CONGRESSIONAL INFORMATION SER
7101 WISCONSIN AV/NW
WASHINGTON DC 20014

RECEIVED
MAR 21 1980

C 2175-1 4

E CHRONICLE
of Higher Education

ISSN 0009-5982

March 17, 1980 • $1
Volume XX, Number 3

News Summary

Articles on inside pages

Students in China are reportedly undergoing a "crisis of confidence" in Marxism. Story on Page 19.

Computer "modeling" is helping Stanford University and other institutions to minimize uncertainty in financial planning. Story on Page 3.

A proposed cut in state income taxes in California may have less of an effect on college and university budgets than officials predicted. Story on Page 2.

The study of aging is too young a discipline to be evaluated according to formal standards, a committee has concluded. Story on Page 4.

Teaching skills are an "underdeveloped" resource of college faculty members, says a prominent researcher. Story on Page 10.

Experts disagree about the economic status of faculty members. Story on Page 10.

Testing agencies are trying to rebut a recent report released by Ralph Nader attacking college-admissions examinations. Story on Page 10.

Higher-education interests are worried about the effects on colleges and universities of President Carter's campaign to reduce federal spending. Story on Page 11.

The new Education Department will begin operating May 7. Story on Page 11.

Proposals by the Carter Administration to end federal support for health-professions schools were met with criticism on Capitol Hill. Story on Page 17.

President Carter's plan to resume draft registration is in trouble in Congress. Story on Page 12.

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE

Books	24
Bulletin Board	35-71
Calendar	32-34
Canadian News	19
Deadlines	34
Deaths	31
Fact-File	8
Gazette	31
Grants	31
International News	19
Letters	22-23
Marginalia	2
News in Brief	2
Point of View	72
Science	18
Textbooks	25-30
Washington News	11-17

U.S. Told to Continue Aid to Students at College that Wouldn't File Bias Form

Judge rules that HEW must prove programs are discriminatory before it cuts off funds

By Cheryl M. Fields

PITTSBURGH

A U. S. District Court judge has ruled that the federal government cannot cut off aid to students at a private college because the institution refused to file a form certifying that it was complying with an anti-sex-bias law.

Judge Paul A. Simmons of the U. S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania ruled that student-aid funds could not be cut off "unless and until there is a showing of actual sex discrimination involving student programs at the college."

The judge also ruled that the "assurance form" itself had been improperly drafted and that the government could not demand that the college sign it.

Judge Simmons said the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could not require the college to sign the assurance form because it "improperly requires the college to abide by" regulations concerning elimination of sex bias in colleges' employment policies. Those rules have been struck down by the courts, the judge noted.

The ruling came in a lawsuit filed against the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by Grove City College, a small, church-related institution.

Excerpts from the Grove City College decision appear on Page 14.

Citing the fact that it accepts no direct federal assistance, the college refused to sign the form it received from H.E.W. in 1976 asking it to certify that it was complying with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, which bars sex bias in federally financed education programs or activities.

The college filed suit after a federal administrative-law judge ruled that Grove City was, indeed, a recipient of federal aid because its students received Basic Educational Opportunity Grants and Guaranteed Student Loans. The judge ordered the money cut off.

Judge Simmons also held that the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants received by students at Grove City constituted federal assistance to the college. Even though the grants are made to students, he said, the institution eventually receives the money.

"Since funds are provided which the college would otherwise have to supply from

Continued on Page 15, Column 3

Government, Universities Urged to End Feud over Accounting for Research Expenditures

By Jack Magarrell

WASHINGTON

"Mutual suspicions, ignorance, and misunderstandings" block the way to agreement between research universities and the government on accounting for research funds, the National Commission on Research said last week.

The commission was organized by six university and research groups to study such problems.

With growing frequency, government auditors have been accusing universities of sloppy administration—and universities have been accusing the government of heavy-handed application of industrial auditing rules to complex combinations of research and education.

"The situation cannot be allowed to drift from bad to worse," the commission said.

In the first of a series of position papers dealing with relations between government agencies and research institutions, the panel called for new accounting rules that would simultaneously meet the demands of government for proper records and of researchers for freedom and flexibility in their work.

The commission, finding a "noticeable deterioration" in the university-government partnership in the past decade, warned:

"The universities and the government have no time to lose in finding a satisfactory basis for continuing their partnership. The universities must assure the government that they have the resources and procedures to fulfill federal agreements. The government must recognize that there are well-defined limits on its intervention into the policies and operations of universities."

In 1978, auditors of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare contended that the universities under their jurisdiction were unable to account properly for some $85-million out of a total $1.5-billion in federal research funds.

The text of the commission's conclusions and recommendations appears on Page 9.

The money may have been properly spent, the auditors said, but there was no way of verifying that. University records, they said, were inadequate.

One of the key problems of accountability arises from a conflict between multipurpose research and single-purpose grants.

"Universities carry out teaching, research, and service as an integrated whole, not as separate functions," the commission observed. "Federal programs are usually designed to support only one of these functions. . . .

"Federal officials striving to obtain the

Continued on Page 8, Column 1

Soviet Science Academy Takes No Action Against Sakharov

The Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. surprised many Western scientists this month by not expelling dissident physicist Andrei D. Sakharov at its annual meeting. Mr. Sakharov himself issued a statement saying he had been notified that he should not attend the meeting.

Mr. Sakharov, who won the Nobel Peace prize in 1975, was exiled in January to Gorki, a city about 250 miles from Moscow that is closed to foreigners.

His exile was cited by the National Academy of Sciences last month when its council voted to suspend for at least six months all bilateral symposia, seminars, and workshops with the Soviet academy.

Rumors that the Russian academy would expel Mr. Sakharov were widespread in Moscow. According to one account, a member of the Communist Party's Central Committee had asked Anatoly P. Aleksandrov, president of the academy, whether it would be possible for the academy to expel the dissident physicist.

However, after the academy's three-day meeting, a spokesman told Western journalists that the question of Mr. Sakharov's expulsion "never came up."

FACT–FILE

U.S. Funds for Colleges and Universities

The top 100 institutions in total federal obligations for fiscal 1978

Institution	Research and development[1] Amount	Rank	Total federal obligations[1] Amount	Rank
Johns Hopkins U.	$196,081,000	1	$212,866,000	1
Mass. Inst. of Technology	114.021,000	2	130,586,000	2
Howard U.[2]	5,715,000	126	116,195,000	3
U. of Washington	76,080,000	5	105,671,000	4
U. of Wis., Madison	65,225,000	8	99,330,000	5
U. of Cal., Los Angeles	69,595,000	6	97,779,000	6
Stanford U.	80,110,000	3	94,009,000	7
U. of Minnesota	59,582,000	10	93,558,000	8
Harvard U.	68,520,000	7	89,949,000	9
U. of Cal., San Diego	77,033,000	4	88,508,000	10
U. of Michigan	58,444,000	11	86,527,000	11
Columbia U., Main Div.	64,687,000	9	84,941,000	12
Cornell U.	58,258,000	12	79,729,000	13
U. of Pennsylvania	56,138,000	13	78,350,000	14
Yale U.	53,805,000	14	67,892,000	15
Pennsylvania State U.	41,974,000	20	66,767,000	16
U. of Cal., Berkeley	49,663,000	15	65,720,000	17
Ohio State U.	33,983,000	25	64,107,000	18
U. of Chicago	48,984,000	16	61,262,000	19
U. of Southern Cal.	42,458,000	19	61,039,000	20
U. of Cal., San Fran.	46,388,000	17	59,488,000	21
U. of Illinois, Urbana	42,947,000	18	58,840,000	22
New York U.	38,235,000	22	54,905,000	23
U. of Colorado	32,091,000	27	53,375,000	24
Washington U.	41,974,000	21	52,162,000	25
U. of Texas, Austin	37,232,000	23	47,701,000	26
Duke U.	34,632,000	24	46,870,000	27
U. of Rochester	33,616,000	26	46,653,000	28
Purdue U.	29,554,000	28	44,383,000	29
U. of N. C., Chapel Hill	26,555,000	34	43,691,000	30
Michigan State U.	21,792,000	42	43,666,000	31
U. of Utah	29,352,000	29	42,863,000	32
U. of Miami	25,744,000	38	41,713,000	33
U. of Pittsburgh	25,984,000	36	41,319,000	34
U. of Arizona	25,828,000	37	39,534,000	35
U. of Florida	21,464,000	44	38,751,000	36
U. of Cal., Davis	27,721,000	32	38,476,000	37
Northwestern U.	26,635,000	33	38,401,000	38
Inter Amer. U. of Puerto Rico, San German	0	—	37,894,000	39
U. of Ala., Birmingham	21,466,000	43	37,552,000	40
U. of Iowa	24,371,000	40	37,326,000	41
Boston U.	19,726,000	50	36,948,000	42
Yeshiva U.	28,710,000	30	36,340,000	43
U. of New Mexico	18,392,000	57	34,786,000	44
Case Western Res. U.	24,730,000	39	34,659,000	45
Texas A&M U.	20,168,000	47	34,204,000	46
U. of Tenn., Knoxville	18,462,000	56	33,329,000	47
Gallaudet College[2]	371,000	287	33,103,000	48
Rutgers, The State U.	13,537,000	71	32,552,000	49
U. of Kentucky	11,921,000	80	31,988,000	50
Cal. Inst. of Technology	28,106,000	31	30,907,000	51
U. of Mo., Columbia	13,676,000	69	30,113,000	52

Institution	Research and development[2] Amount	Rank	Total federal obligations[2] Amount	Rank
Baylor C. of Medicine	26,476,000	35	30,042,000	53
Colorado State U.	20,371,000	46	29,017,000	54
U. of Virginia	18,883,000	53	28,913,000	55
U. of Md., College Park	19,347,000	52	28,562,000	56
Louisiana State U.	13,799,000	68	27,901,000	57
U. of Mass., Amherst	10,602,000	87	27,876,000	58
U. of Kansas	16,179,000	63	27,541,000	59
Oregon State U.	18,532,000	55	27,462,000	60
Indiana U., Bloomington	10,949,000	86	26,383,000	61
U. of Hawaii, Manoa	17,233,000	59	25,884,000	62
Temple U.	12,559,000	76	25,845,000	63
U. of Connecticut	14,923,000	65	25,526,000	64
Vanderbilt U.	20,139,000	48	25,050,000	65
Ga. Inst. of Technology	22,122,000	41	24,877,000	66
New Mexico State U.	16,260,000	62	24,695,000	67
U. of Md. Baltimore Professional Schools	16,592,000	61	23,467,000	68
U. of Alaska, Fairbanks	20,133,000	49	23,424,000	69
No. Carolina St. U., Raleigh	11,436,000	84	23,315,000	70
U. of Tex. - Anderson Hosp. & Tumor Inst.	21,213,000	45	23,301,000	71
Va. Poly. Inst. & St. U.	14,501,000	66	23,090,000	72
U. of Georgia	14,180,000	67	22,876,000	73
Wayne State U.	10,385,000	88	22,732,000	74
U. of Cincinnati	13,362,000	72	22,631,000	75
CUNY, Mount Sinai School of Medicine	18,868,000	54	22,317,000	76
U. of Tex. Health Science Center, Dallas	16,084,000	64	22,211,000	77
Washington State U.	8,831,000	92	22,178,000	78
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute	19,621,000	51	21,465,000	79
U. of Vt. & St. Agric. C.	12,059,000	79	21,090,000	80
Princeton U.	16,759,000	60	20,721,000	81
Virginia Commonwealth U.	11,368,000	85	20,456,000	82
Florida State U.	9,511,000	89	20,303,000	83
SUNY, Buffalo	13,155,000	73	20,187,000	84
Puerto Rico Jr. C.	0	—	19,942,000	85
Georgetown U.	11,595,000	83	19,896,000	86
U. of Ill. Med. Ctr., Chicago	7,924,000	102	19,835,000	87
U. of Oklahoma	7,347,000	108	19,459,000	88
City Colleges of Chicago	0	—	19,370,000	89
Iowa St. U. of Sci.& Tech.	8,958,000	91	19,248,000	90
Oklahoma State U.	8,181,000	98	18,926,000	91
Rockefeller U.	17,473,000	58	18,868,000	92
George Washington U.	13,003,000	74	18,842,000	93
Emory U.	12,921,000	75	18,540,000	94
Mississippi State U.	6,445,000	119	18,283,000	95
Auburn U.	5,957,000	123	18,126,000	96
Carnegie-Mellon U.	13,569,000	70	17,699,000	97
U. of Cal., Irvine	11,861,000	81	17,624,000	98
West Virginia U.	7,087,000	112	17,357,000	99
SUNY, Stony Brook	12,372,000	77	17,173,000	100
U. S. total	**$2,089,954,000**		**$3,098,257,000**	

[1] Amounts shown represent total obligations from 14 federal agencies which accounted for over 95 percent of all federal obligations to universities and colleges in the United States and for 99 percent of all federal obligations to such institutions for research and development. These proportions may not apply to all individual institutions, some of which receive significant amounts of their funding from agencies not included in the survey, such as the Department of Justice, the Veterans' Administration, and the Smithsonian Institution. Amounts shown represent awards to individual institutions. Awards to the administrative offices of university systems are excluded from institutional totals because final allocation of funds is unknown but are included in "U. S. total."

[2] Howard U. and Gallaudet C. receive substantial appropriations from Congress each year for general operating expenses: their relative rankings thus reflect the magnitude of their nonscience programs.

SOURCE: NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION